



architects

a publication of the california architects board ■ public protection through examination, licensure, and regulation

ARE Changes Coming in 2008

In July 2008, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) will be reformatting the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) Version 3.1 from nine to seven divisions and introducing the new examination as Version 4.0. Version 4.0 will be more integrative and will include six divisions containing both graphic vignettes and multiple-choice questions and one division with only graphic vignettes. According to NCARB, the goal of ARE 4.0 is to better integrate the examination while improving the assessment of a candidate's knowledge, skill, and ability to practice architecture independently. Provided below is additional information about the ARE transition plan and its impact.

Future ARE Version 4.0 Candidates

As noted above, ARE 4.0 will be available for ARE candidates beginning in July 2008. Candidates who do not take and pass any division of ARE 3.1 prior to May 2008 will not be affected by the transition to ARE 4.0. New candidates will not be able to test in May and June 2008 as NCARB implements Version 4.0.

Current ARE Version 3.1 Candidates

Candidates who have passed at least one division of ARE 3.1 prior to May 2008 will have until June 2009 to pass all remaining divisions of ARE 3.1. Candidates must pass all divisions of ARE 3.1 by June 2009, otherwise they will be required to transition to ARE 4.0.

NCARB has created a transition chart that indicates how Version 3.1 divisions correlate to Version 4.0 divisions.

Candidates who are in the process of taking ARE 3.1 (or expect to begin it prior to May 2008) should review this chart to determine the most strategic way to take divisions to accommodate both the transition to the new version and the mandatory six-month waiting period required by NCARB if they fail a division. For example, according to the transition chart, if a candidate fails the Building Technology division under Version 3.1, the candidate will be required to take and pass four divisions in Version 4.0. This could include divisions they already passed in Version 3.1. Candidates are encouraged to visit NCARB's Web site (www.ncarb.org/are/40/transitionchartweb.pdf) to review the transition chart.



President's Message

By Jeffrey D. Heller, FAIA, Board President

You may have read about the new National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) standard for access to the Architect Registration Examination (ARE). "Early ARE" is something NCARB has been working on for some time. Those efforts culminated in a resolution being brought before the nation's architectural registration boards at their annual meeting in June. Our Board was very concerned about this issue, because we greatly value our flexible licensing standards.

Resolution 07-8 would have amended the NCARB "Handbook for Interns and Architects" to stipulate that candidates are eligible to take the ARE once they enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP). However, candidates would be prohibited from taking two divisions — Building Design and Construction Systems, and Construction Documents and Services — until they have completed IDP.

Holding these two divisions back from candidates was problematic for many NCARB Member Boards, but a more pressing issue was that by placing the policy in the "Handbook," it would essentially become a national standard to be implemented by NCARB. Licensing boards would no longer have the primary role in determining candidate eligibility standards.

The California Board pointed out that all states are different and their standards reflect the philosophy of their legislature. California's standards are flexible because that is what is expected by our legislature. Other states are more rigid for the same reason. We firmly believe that state boards should set eligibility standards. Yes, we should continue to work toward the portability of the license between states, but it is the responsibility of state boards to make that call.

We were also concerned that there was limited data about the appropriateness of holding back the two divisions. Since an examination is a measurement of competence, if a candidate passes the ARE and completes the other requirements for licensure (education and internship), he or she should be able to apply for licensure. Two NCARB committees that reviewed this resolution wrestled with these factors as well.

The American Institute of Architects' (AIA) Associates were keenly aware of this issue and strong advocates for states' rights and early-unimpeded access to the examination. I would also like to thank RK Stewart, FAIA, current AIA President. RK was present at the June meeting and provided invaluable support.

Ultimately, the NCARB membership adopted an amended resolution that did not contain the restrictive language in the "Handbook" and amended NCARB model law to clarify that internship and examination should be available concurrently (the vote was 42-9). I couldn't agree more.

ARE Changes Coming in 2008

Continued from page 1

Impact of "Rolling Clock" on Transition

Effective January 1, 2006 NCARB implemented a "Rolling Clock" provision for the validity of ARE scores. Under that provision, candidates for the ARE are required to pass all divisions of the examination within a five-year period. The "rolling clock" begins once the first division is passed. Candidates will retain the original five-year period that started under Version 3.1 as they transition to Version 4.0.

Where to Obtain More Information

Candidates can find important information related to the examination transition by visiting NCARB's Web site at www.ncarb.org. The site includes the latest update on ARE Version 4.0 and the transition plan proposed for candidates currently taking ARE Version 3.1. Candidates can email NCARB specific ARE-related questions at are@ncarb.org.

Candidates may contact the California Architects Board by telephone at (916) 574-7220 or by email at cab@dca.ca.gov.





NEW NCARB PRESIDENT

RESPONDS TO QUESTIONS

In June 2007, Douglas K. Engebretson became president of the NCARB Board of Directors. He recently responded to a series of questions presented by the California Architects Board.

What are your top priorities as president and what will they be for the duration of your term?

The 11 strategies in our Strategic Plan remain the focus for the ongoing attention of the NCARB Board of Directors and the work that we are doing. Of those 11, I believe we will make significant progress in at least four areas that I consider my top priorities:

1) Architect Registration Exam (ARE); 2) Intern Development Program (IDP); 3) customer service; and, 4) determining a course of action on the issues around interior architecture.

ARE 4.0 has been in the creation stage for several years, and its roll out will complete this cycle of exam improvements with a reorganized exam structure that includes fewer divisions and therefore fewer potential trips to the testing centers. Additionally, upgraded technologies will drive the exam. With the final testing and evaluation sequences underway, it will become available at the end of this fiscal year.

The IDP is and has been receiving additional attention to align the experience with the needed skill sets identified in the practice analysis. Furthermore, we must find ways to enhance the delivery of the experience through greater awareness by the practitioners of how important a role they play in making the program as good as it can be. IDP needs the focused collaboration of all five of the collaterals to make it the learning experience for the intern that we know is critical.

We are increasing our efforts with regard to customer service issues this year. The renewed push to find better ways to serve our customers began recently with a Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Study currently underway. The NCARB Board of Directors is intent on using this re-evaluation to determine how we can improve the personal and automated means of communicating, receiving, and exchanging information with our Council customers, including those involved with IDP, ARE, and our Certificate holders. We have been monitoring our service response times for several months, and while significant progress has been made over the last several years, we have determined that we need to continue to upgrade and improve our ability to respond to our customers. The NCARB Board of Directors believes this BPR Study will guide the Council in making the investment in new programming and systems that are more responsive to our customers' needs, and that will provide improved tracking opportunities as they progress through the system.

This year, we will be bringing renewed energy to understanding the implications of some proposed legislation coming before our state legislatures. Some of this legislation tries to separate the inside and outside of a building in terms of which party should assume responsibility for the architecture of each portion. Several of our committees and task forces will be exploring the role that NCARB and the collaterals could assume pertaining to those individuals

who may wish to focus their professional services on the interior architecture of a building.

What are the most difficult challenges facing NCARB?

From the service side — being patient in seeing improved response times and enhanced customer service initiatives coming to fruition.

From the program side — achieving the transparent portability of the Certificate and its unqualified acceptance by all jurisdictions to ease the licensing process of certified architects who seek to practice in other states.

How do you see IDP evolving in the future?

IDP will evolve predicated on a lot of work by all the collaterals (The American Institute of Architects [AIA], Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture [ACSA], National Architectural Accrediting Board [NAAB], American Institute of Architecture Students [AIAS] and NCARB) and an understanding by interns of the importance of the process. We expect IDP to continue to improve and fill a need for experience that is integral to the development of the next generation of architects. This will happen by better understanding how practical learning can occur with the new technologies: focusing on the way architects are now manipulating information and data to achieve the buildings they design, as well as on the knowledge inherent in the original creation of that data and the assembly of building materials to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

What is your view on the status of architectural education in the United States?

Clearly, ACSA is diligent in continuing the evolution of educational opportunities in keeping with the needs of the profession. NAAB is beginning the reassessment process for updating the accreditation requirements for the schools of architecture to ensure that the education meets the needs of the profession. At no other time have changes to the profession been as swift and wide-ranging as we have seen in the past quarter century. The impacts we are feeling today from that dynamic shift are yet to be resolved. The resilience of our educational system will find a way to absorb these pressures and provide the appropriate education needed to prepare our future architects.

NCARB provides a variety of services to Member Boards, Certificate holders, and examination candidates. In what areas of NCARB services would you most like to see improvement?

Besides those customer service issues addressed in the first question, I would also like to see our communications become even more effective and our pertinent messages provided to a wider audience. Much of this becomes a function of scale, and therefore has its limitations. However, with technology and the willingness of the collateral organizations to appropriately share contact data, we

Continued on page 4

Public Access to Licensee Information

The California Architects Board (Board) is one of numerous boards, bureaus, commissions, committees, and programs within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) responsible for consumer protection and regulation of a licensed profession. Certain licensee information is made public and available upon request from either the Board or DCA. Following is information regarding the disclosure of licensee information.

Public Sales List

In accordance with the Information Practices Act, Civil Code section 1798.61, and Business and Professions Code section 161, the DCA provides information to the public regarding more than 150 professional license types, including architects. The DCA Public Sales Unit processes requests for public mailing lists of licensees. The public list includes the following license information:

- Licensee name
- Address of record
- License number
- License issue date
- License expiration date

If a licensee requests in writing to be removed from the list, the Board will place a sales hold (or opt out) on the license record and the licensee's information will be withheld from any subsequent mailing list request.

Written requests for a public sales hold should be submitted to the Board at 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834.

Individuals who are interested in obtaining the public list may contact the DCA Public Sales Unit at (916) 574-8150 or by email at public_sales@dca.ca.gov.

Web Site License Look-up

Consumers are able to check the status of an individual licensee on the Board's Web site using the Licensee Search feature. The following information is currently available on the Web site at www.cab.ca.gov:

- Licensee name
- License number
- License issue date
- License expiration date
- City and county associated with the licensee's address of record

In addition, the licensee's full address of record is provided via telephone or email upon request.

Only current and valid licenses are listed on the Web site. Information about expired licenses is not provided.

Confidential information such as licensees' Social Security Numbers or birth dates are never provided to a consumer or listed on the Board's Web site.

New NCARB President Responds to Questions

should be able to connect with the whole universe of architects practicing in the United States, as well as provide relevant information to inform the public on the important role of architects in protecting their health, safety, and welfare.

What do you see as California's role in NCARB?

California plays an important role in voicing concerns of the state in the areas of regulation, training, and mobility of its architects. Through the active participation of your Board Members and Board Executive, at the Annual Meeting, in your region, and in the various committees and task forces of NCARB — your voice is heard and your contribution is appreciated. The work that California is doing with regard to the CIDP will inform the evolution of the IDP program on a national level, and NCARB looks forward to California sharing the outcomes of this program. NCARB has benefited greatly from the attention that your Board has given our work together over the years, and I hope that you sense the appreciation for both the constructive and critical messages that have been shared.

How will NCARB adapt IDP to the changing profession?

Responding to the Practice Analysis and the current update in terms of the requirements of IDP is one important example of how NCARB is adapting IDP to the changing profession. You are also seeing NCARB focus on IDP in the work that we are doing with regard to revisiting the issues of responsible control and direct supervision. These impact the outsourcing and off-shoring issues that are prominent in our professional lives today and may have a significant impact on the practical work that interns participate in while employed in our firms.

There have been a lot of changes to the ARE. What is the future of the exam?

Maintaining the currency and security of the ARE will be the primary focus for the future. After that, keeping up with technology in its delivery and seeing that it continues to be the legally defensible and psychometrically justifiable vehicle to assess the achievement of a minimum level of competency to practice architecture independently will always be the future of the ARE.

Is NCARB concerned about the supply of architects, and how is NCARB addressing the issue?

"NCARB is the council of architectural registration boards committed to exemplary service, effective regulation, and protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public." This mission statement speaks to our primary focus of protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public. While we seek to do this with appropriate requirements and reasonable processes, it is not our charge to be concerned about the supply of architects. We certainly believe that the public will be best served by availing themselves of the services of architects where the development of buildings for human use and habitation is concerned.

How will BIM affect NCARB and Member Boards and how is NCARB addressing the issue?

We have a BIM Task Force that is researching the effect of BIM on the ability of architects to maintain responsible control over the work they produce. This Task Force is also charged with developing an understanding of the implications of control over the BIM the architect produces and how it may be altered without the knowledge or responsible control of the architect who needs to maintain responsibility for the building that the model represents.



Can Building Departments Release Copies of Plans?

The California Architects Board often gets telephone calls or emails from licensees wanting to know if building departments can release copies of their plans to individuals asking for them. Building departments cannot release plans to “just anyone”; however, they can allow duplication by parties who comply with specific conditions.

From where does their authority come and what are the conditions? California Health and Safety Code (HSC) sections 19850 – 19853 define the authority and responsibility for city and county building departments to retain, provide access to, and allow for duplication of official copies of plans for buildings constructed in their jurisdiction. The following paraphrased excerpts from the HSC do not cover all details, conditions, and nuances of the law, but they provide sufficient detail for individuals to gain a basic understanding of the law covering retention and maintenance of official city or county building department plan files. (Note: the provisions of the referenced law do not apply to any building containing a bank, other financial institution, or public utility.)

Authority to Retain Copies

HSC section 19850 requires every building department to maintain official copies of the plans for every building for which a building permit was issued. Such copies must be maintained for the life of the building. Buildings exempt from this

requirement include: a) single or multiple family dwellings not more than two stories and basement in height; b) garages and other structures appurtenant to buildings defined in (a); c) farm or ranch buildings; and, d) any one-story building with spans between bearing walls of 25 feet or less. The exemptions in (a) and (b) do not apply to “common interest developments” and the exemption in (d) does not apply to steel frame or concrete buildings.

Authority to Provide Access

HSC section 19851(a) requires that official copies of plans maintained by a city or county are to be available on the building department premises for “inspection only” as a public record. These official copies “...may not be duplicated in whole or in part except...” as provided in subsection 19851(a)(1).

Authority to Allow Duplication

HSC section 19851(a) defines two exceptions to the “no duplication” rule. The plans can be duplicated upon receipt of 1) the written permission of the certified, licensed, or registered design professional who signed the original documents and the written permission of the original or current owner of the building; or, 2) a court order or a request from any state agency.

Responsibility to Control Duplication

HSC section 19851(c) requires the building department to furnish an

affidavit form that the person requesting duplication of the plans must complete and sign. The signed affidavit is required to contain all of the following provisions and acknowledgments:

1. The copy of the plans shall only be used for the maintenance, operation, and use of the building;
2. The plans are instruments of professional service and are incomplete without the interpretation of the design professional of record; and,
3. The complete text of the liability protections found in Business and Professions Code section 5536.25 of the Architects Practice Act shall be included herein.

What if the Design Professional Refuses Request for Duplication?

The city or county may override the design professional’s refusal to grant permission for duplication if the refusal is deemed “unreasonable” as defined in law. By definitions in HSC section 19851(f), such refusal is deemed unreasonable if the design professional does either of the following: 1) fails to respond to the building department’s request; or, 2) refuses permission after receiving the signed affidavit and registered letters defined in law.



Enforcement Actions

CAB is responsible for receiving and investigating complaints against licensees and unlicensed persons. CAB also retains the authority to make final decisions on all enforcement actions taken against its licensees. Included below is a brief description of recent enforcement actions taken by CAB against individuals who were found to be in violation of the Architects Practice Act. Every effort is made to ensure the following information is correct. Before making any decision based upon this information, you should contact CAB. Further information on specific violations may also be obtained by contacting the Board's Enforcement Unit at (916) 575-7208.

CITATIONS

GARO GIRAGOS BABIKIAN (Dana Point)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$3,000 civil penalty to Garo Giragos Babikian, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of Business and Professions Code (BPC) sections 5536(a) and (b) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Babikian submitted plans to the City of Laguna Beach with a title block stating the word "Architect" and "License C9865." Babikian executed a "Construction Management Agreement" with a client on letterhead that stated "Garo Babikian – Architect." Babikian put out a business card that stated "Garo Babikian – Architect AIA." The business card stated that he provides "Architecture." On or about July 10, 2002, Babikian submitted a letter to the City of Laguna Beach Building Official that stated Garo Babikian – Architect" and bore a stamp that read "Garo Babikian," "Licensed Architect," the legend "State of California," "NO. C9865," and "EXP. 1/31/04." On or about August 28, 2002, a photograph was taken of a sign located in Laguna Beach stating "Garo Babikian, Architect." The citation became effective on March 26, 2007. Previously in an administrative action, the Board revoked Garo Giragos Babikian's architect license number C-9865 on November 16, 2000.

DAVID CHARLES BREWER (Santa Ana)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to David Charles Brewer, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Brewer's Web site, www.creative-groups.com, stated that he specializes in "Architectural Design." In addition, Brewer's title block on plans for a project stated "Architecture & Civil Engineering." The citation became effective on April 9, 2007.

HOWARD CAMERON (Piedmont)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Howard Cameron, an unlicensed individual, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Cameron submitted a cost proposal to his client offering "Architectural" redesign services for a residence. The citation became effective on April 23, 2007.

RICHARD M. CAMPONUEVO (Daly City)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Richard M. Camponuevo, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of BPC sections 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect) and 5536.1(c) (Unauthorized Practice). The action alleged that Camponuevo offered to prepare and prepared construction plans for a three-story residence, which is not a building described in BPC section 5537(a) as an exempt building. The citation became effective on February 2, 2007.

VALENCIA O. GABRIEL (Montebello)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Valencia O. Gabriel, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of BPC sections 5536(a) and (b) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Gabriel prepared plans using a title block, which stated the word "architecture" and identified Gabriel as the architect. The citation became effective on February 13, 2007.

SIMON KARKAFI (Los Angeles)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,500 civil penalty to Simon Karkafi, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of BPC sections 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect) and 5536.1(c) (Unauthorized Practice). The action alleged that Karkafi

offered to prepare and prepared construction plans for six four-story condominiums, which are not buildings described in BPC section 5537(a) as exempt. In addition, the construction drawings identified Karkafi's company, Eurocon Group, Inc., as the "Architect." Karkafi paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on March 26, 2007.

GREG LEKOSIS (Los Angeles)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Greg Lekosis, architect license number C-29129, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5584 (Negligence). The action alleged that Lekosis terminated his Agreement of Association with an unlicensed person and failed to properly notify the clients in writing that he was no longer the architect of record on their project. Lekosis paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on March 5, 2007.

JOHN WILLIAM McMURRAY (Laguna Beach)

The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$2,000 civil penalty to John William McMurray, architect license number C-6223, for alleged violations of BPC sections 5536.22(a) (Written Contract) and 5584 (Negligence). The action alleged that McMurray entered into written contracts with the Army Navy Academy to provide architectural design for two dormitory buildings. The contracts did not contain McMurray's license number. He changed code-compliant windows to non code-compliant windows, misinterpreted the Building Code and caused financial damage to the client in the amount of \$382,325.51. McMurray failed to seek and obtain written approval from the City for these changes, which is the standard of practice. McMurray paid the civil penalty, satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on April 9, 2007.

ARCHITECTS PRACTICE ACT UPDATE

ROBERT M. NOGUERA (Los Angeles) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Robert M. Noguera dba Design Master USA & Co., Inc., an unlicensed individual, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect.) The action alleged that Noguera executed a "Contract Form: DMUSA – 04 Design Master USA & Co., Inc. & Client Agreement" with a client to provide services to design a new residence. The contract contained a listing, "Services to be Rendered by Design Master USA" and indicated that "Architectural Planning" would be provided. The citation became effective on March 23, 2007.

ALAN PINEL (Pasadena) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Alan Pinel dba Alpine Design, an unlicensed individual, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Pinel's Web site, www.puravidateam.com/AlpineDesign/alpinedesign revealed that his firm provides "Architectural Design" and "Architectural Plans." The citation became effective on February 20, 2007.

JEFF SAMUDIO (Hollywood) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Jeff Samudio, an unlicensed individual, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Samudio invoiced his client for architectural services after his Agreement of Association with a licensed architect had been terminated. In addition, Samudio's letterhead on the invoice stated "Design Aid Architects." The citation became effective on March 5, 2007.

The California Architects Practice Act, with rules and regulations, was recently updated on the Board's Web site to include all amendments since the last hard copy printing. The updated version is available at www.cab.ca.gov under the heading "Architects Practice Act" or by contacting the Board at (916) 574-7220.

The most recent change to the California Code of Regulations (CCR) contained in the Act revises and adds new clauses to the Rules of Professional Conduct. Additions to CCR Section 160, Rules of Professional Conduct effective August 11, 2007 were adopted to compel the following:

- An architect or a candidate for licensure must respond to the Board's requests for information and/or evidence within 30 days.
- When acting as the interpreter of construction contract documents and the judge of construction contract performance, an architect must endeavor to secure faithful performance to all parties of the construction contract and not show partiality to any party.
- An architect must respond in writing within 30 days to any request from the Board for information solicited in connection with a candidate's application for a license to practice architecture and to accurately report a candidate's training or experience for the period of time that the architect had direct supervision of the candidate.
- An architect may not materially alter the scope or objective of a project without first fully informing the client and obtaining the consent of the client in writing.

Licensees and candidates are reminded that violation of any of the above regulations may result in an administrative action.

For a copy of the full text of these regulations visit the Board's Web site www.cab.ca.gov under the link "Architects Practice Act" or contact the Board at (916) 574-7220.

Written Contract Requirements

While mediating/investigating consumer complaints, the Board often finds that an architect failed to execute a written contract prior to commencing work or that one or more required elements of the contract are missing. Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5536.22(a) requires architects to use a written contract when contracting to provide professional services to a client. The law also requires that the contract be executed by the architect and client prior to the architect commencing work. Review your contract language to ensure it includes, at a minimum, the following elements required by law:

- Description of services to be provided by the architect to the client;
- Description of any basis of compensation applicable to the contract and method of payment agreed upon by both parties;
- Name, address, and license number of the architect and the name and address of the client;
- Description of the procedure that the architect and the client will use to accommodate additional services; and
- Description of the procedure to be used by either party to terminate the contract.

A simple document that contains the above elements will comply with BPC section 5536.22. However, good business practice may warrant additional terms and conditions, especially on more complex projects. In all cases, the contract should be as clear and complete as possible in defining the goals and expectations of both parties.

architects

California Architects Board

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Board Members

Jeffrey D. Heller, President, Architect Member
Jon Alan Baker, Vice President, Architect Member
Iris Cochlan, Secretary, Public Member
Larry Guidi, Public Member
Pasqual Gutierrez, Architect Member
Marilyn Lyon, Public Member
Michael Merino, Architect Member
Cynthia Choy Ong, Public Member
Sheran Voigt, Public Member

Douglas R. McCauley, Executive Officer

PRSRT STD
U.S. Postage
PAID

Permit No. 1028
Sacramento, CA

In This Issue Summer 2007

ARE Changes Coming in 2008	1
President's Message	2
New NCARB President Responds to Questions	3
Public Access to Licensee Information	4
Can Building Departments Release Copies of Plans?	5
Enforcement Actions	6
Architects Practice Act Update	7
Written Contract Requirements.....	7

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD

PUBLIC PROTECTION THROUGH EXAMINATION, LICENSURE, AND REGULATION

YOUR INPUT CAN HELP Shape the Content of the CSE

In October 2007, the Board will be conducting a Web-based Occupational Analysis survey on the practice of architecture in California. The Occupational Analysis survey will be sent to a selected sample of architects who will represent all California licensed architects. The survey results will be used to develop the test plan on which the California Supplemental Examination (CSE) is based. Participating in this survey is an opportunity for architects to shape the content of the CSE and assure the quality of architectural practice into the future.

If you receive an invitation to participate, please take the time to give us your professional opinion. We all know the profession is changing and this is your chance to tell us how.

To Get In Touch With Us

California Architects Board • 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 • Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7220 • Fax: (916) 575-7283 • Email: cab@dca.ca.gov • www.cab.ca.gov